DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 258 SP 003 034

Ten-College Conference on Implications of the Bureau of Research Teacher Education Project for Developing Institutions (July 11-12, 1969).

Spons Agency-North Carolina Central Univ., Durham.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Pub Date Jul 69

Note-27p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45

Descriptors-*Conferences, Educational Innovation, Elementary School Teachers, *Models, *Program Design, Program Development, *Teacher Education

Identifiers-North Carolina Central University, *Specifications for Elementary Teacher Education

This document reports an initial conference of ten small developing colleges which are contracted to study the feasibility of instituting all or parts of the nine teacher education program models developed in the Teacher Education Project of the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). Included in the report are summaries of prepared statements by each participating college (brief descriptions of the college and its teacher education program: Clark College, Georgia; Florida A. & M. University; Livingston University, Alabama; Jarvis Christian College, Texas; North Carolina Central University; Shaw University, North Carolina; South Carolina State College; Tennessee State University; Xavier University, Louisiana; and Norfolk State College, Virginia. It also contains (1) an overview of each of the nine USOE models with a lists of points of commonality which were discussed; (2) content summary of addresses and discussion on the problems of innovation in teacher education (includes lists of difficulties involved in the development and implementation of the models and an outline of procedures to be followed in reviewing, designing, and implementing programs; and (3) summary of conclusions reached at small group sessions to initiate plans for cooperating in the common problems of the feasibility study. Appended is a roster of the 38 participants. (JS)

ED032258

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TEN-COLLEGE CONFERENCE OF IMPLICATIONS

OF THE

BUREAU OF RESEARCH TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT

FOR DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

July 11 - 12, 1969

Sponsored By

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY

AND

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION, BUREAU OF RESEARCH

Conference Coordinator - NORMAN C. JOHNSON
CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

SP003034

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE GENERAL SESSIONS 2

"The Ten Colleges Present" 3

"Overview of the Nine Models" 12

"Teacher Education and Problems of Innovation" 16

III. SMALL GROUP PLANNING SESSION: A SUMMARY 19

APPENDICES 21

A. Roster of Participants, 22

B. Program of Activities, 25

PART I

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The teaching profession has been challenged from many fronts and has begun to answer those challenges. The profession must develop a product which is adequate for continuously developing complex technological society. One answer to the challenge is the U.S.O.E. Teacher Education Project. This Project has developed nine model programs which show great promise for the development of teachers equal to the task posed by our dynamic society. This project has gone further to explore the feasibility of implementing these models and in this view has contracted with ten small developing colleges to study the feasibility of instituting all or parts of the models in those schools.

This report is a result of an initial conference of those ten colleges. The purposes of the conference were to (1) get acquainted, (2) explore points of common interest, (3) become generally familiar with common characteristics and unique features of the nine models, (4) explore problems associated with innovation, and (5) initiate plans for cooperating in the common problem of feasibility study.

PART II

THE GENERAL SESSIONS

THE TEN COLLEGES PRESENT

The first general session of the Ten-College Conference on Implications of the Bureau of Research Teacher Education Project for Developing Institutions was devoted to a series of brief descriptions of the colleges involved in the study and the teacher education programs in those schools.

Each participant received a copy of a prepared statement from each college and only briefs of those statements are presented in this final report.

Clark College

Clark College has been cognizant of a need for "superior teachers" and its commitment to the achievement of this goal has remained constant. Careful analysis of previous efforts to improve Teacher Education Programs of the institution have been most productive when the following guidelines were operative: (1) A thorough review of the foundation from which the present Clark College Elementary Teacher Education Curriculum evolved, (2) Examination of current research, curricula studies, trends, and model programs of Elementary Teacher Education, (3) Study of a plan for testing innovative ideas of Elementary Teacher Education Programs by the Clark College Teacher Education Committee prior to presentation to the staff for adoption.

Prior to the decision to test features of the Bureau of Research Elementary Teacher Education Models--USOE, the institution was already in the process of: (1) Implementing over-all curricula changes recommended by the faculty and the Visiting Committee as a result of the 1966-1968 Institutional Self-Study, and (2) Organizing for a Self-Study of Approved Teacher Education Programs for renewal of the Five-Year Program by the Georgia State Department of Education in April, 1970.

The Project Director and one Associate Director used the following questions as a guide for evaluating the several models: (1) Are any "common features" identifiable that can be assessed as <u>trends</u> in the education of teachers for elementary schools? (2) Can the model be adopted to a four-year, four or five-year, or five-year program without destroying its effectiveness? (3) What was the most distinctive or innovative feature of the respective model? (4) What feature(s) of the models are already operative in the Clark College Program? (5) Which phase(s) of the respective model could be tested successfully without increased faculty, facilities, equipment, or faculty approval? (6) Which phase(s) of the respective model are desirable or could be tested successfully only with increased faculty and/or in-service faculty training, additional facilities and equipment, or faculty approval?

(7) Is it possible to articulate phase(s) of the Elementary Teacher Education Models with the over-all curriculum revisions presently being studied?
(8) Are there significant behaviors of effective teachers needed by Clark College students that have been omitted from the models?

On the bases of several committee meetings decisions were made for planning seminars and workshops, visiting selected institutions where models have been developed, selecting consultants who developed models to work with the Clark College staff, and determining the most effective way(s) to test the phases of the models which are most relevant to the Elementary Education Program of Clark College.

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University is one of seven institutions of higher learning in the State of Florida. It has a student enrollment of approximately 4,000 of which approximately 99 per cent are non-white. There are more than 250 teaching-faculty of bi-racial composition distributed among the six schools and colleges.

Of the seventeen departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, thirteen prepare teachers for the secondary schools and provide the subject matter course preparation for all departments involved in Teacher Education at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The Department of Elementary Education has enrolled between 350 and 380 full-time students each year, and more than 400 part-time and full-time graduate students. The educational program requires 191 quarter hours distributed as follows: General Preparation - 77 hours; Professional Preparation - 39 hours; Specialization Courses (State requirement for certification) - 39 hours; and Minor Electives - 33 hours.

After careful review of the nine Phase I Proposals, the Elementary Models Committee of Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University selected the major portion of the University of Massachusetts' Model with adaptations. This model was, in general, consistent with the prevailing philosophy of the faculty. Many of the department's programs and plans for the future encompassed the spirit of the model.

A major weakness of the present program at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University is that the student does not have adequate opportunity to place theory into practice. Continuous contacts with children is a central feature of the University of Massachusetts' Model. This program includes "early involvement". In this manner, lower division students who express an interest in the teacher education program would be given opportunities to work with children and thereby appraise their suitability for a career in elementary education.

Jarvis Christian College

Jarvis Christian College is a fully accredited independent church related arts and sciences college. It is a developing institution, aware of the forces which demand change, aware of its strength and its weaknesses and in need of program, financial and systems support to maintain its present rate of development. Jarvis has an annual enrollment of approximately six-hundred students and a full-time equivalent faculty of approximately forty persons.

The general objective of Jarvis Christian College is to provide the best undergraduate education in an environment designed to release creative potential of students. This general objective of the College implies our deep concern for the welfare of the society and its institutions.

The teacher education program in its present state is traditional. Students satisfy basic requirements and are then officially admitted into the program after the completion of sixty hours of academic foundations. The sequence of professional courses is typical and culminates with eight weeks of student teaching. Students follow major or minor courses of studies prescribed by the division in which they have specialized. Currently the elementary education degree requires 124 semester hours including sixty hours of academic foundations, eighteen or twenty-four hours in a combination of subjects taught in the elementary school, twelve hours of elementary content courses and eighteen hours of professional development.

The major weaknesses are briefly summarized: (1) There is a lack of coordination and inter-relation among the courses in the program. This results in duplication and omission in the students' development. (2) There is a prescribed program for all students. The current program does not consider individual differences and interests. (3) There is a lack of sufficient laboratory experiences prior to the student teaching semester.

We propose an in-depth study of the objectives, content, and performance specifications of each course in the student's program. Using these we hope to construct and utilize single concept indisciplinary modules, a unique sequence of courses, programmed learning, small seminars, and close student-teacher contact to individualize instruction. Through micro-teaching, simulation, and consultation with public school personnel we hope to improve the laboratory experiences.

As part of this planning process, the Division of Education-Arts and Sciences task force is to devote part of its efforts to the examination of the teacher education models developed by nine institutions under contract with the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education.

Partial reading of the Phase I reports has convinced task force members that these reports represent a most significant source of materials for developing institutions seeking new models for their teacher education programs. From one or more of these models, we hope to create a model effective for Jarvis Christian College.

Livingston University

Livingston University is the smallest state supported university in the State of Alabama. It is located in Southwest Alabama in the center of Sumter County. The anticipated enrollment for the fall of 1969 is calculated at 2,000 pupils. There is a potential student body for Livingston University several times the size which is presently accommodated. This potential includes several thousand Negro students enrolled in the public schools in the service area. Less than ten per cent of the Livingston University student body this summer is Negro.

The College of Education offers undergraduate degrees in Elementary Education and Secondary Education. Graduate programs are offered in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Administration, Counseling and Guidance and a new degree program has been initiated, the Master of Science in Continuing Education.

In 1968-1969, the faculty has been engaged in developing a model for change and utilizing the behavioral objectives to develop Individualized Prescribed Instructional Modules. The College has also been working on a model that would incorporate those features which the faculty felt would be important in terms of our rationale and in the development of the program which we feel will do the best job.

North Carolina Central University

Effective July, 1969, the 1969 General Assembly of North Carolina authorized the change in name and status of North Carolina College at Durham, a liberal arts college, to North Carolina Central University. A revised statement of the purposes which would reflect the institution's status as a regional university has not been issued at this time.

The primary purpose of North Carolina College at Durham was to provide undergraduate instruction in the liberal arts and to train teachers, supervisors and administrators of the public schools of the State.

The Teacher Education Program at North Carolina Central University is the entire series of courses and experiences leading to the North Carolina Class "A" teaching certificate. It includes appropriate preparation in general education subject matter specialization and professional education. The Chairman of the Council on Teacher Education who is also Chairman of the Department of Education provides the administrative leadership for the program.

Preparation in general education and subject matter specialization are primarily the responsibilities of the departments of the student's area of specialization and/or related disciplines, whereas the Department of Education is primarily responsible for the twenty-four semester hours credit that comprise the professional education sequence. Six of these credits are in the area of the school and three are in the area of the pupil. The most unique feature of the professional education sequence is the Senior Semester in Teacher Education which carries 15 semester hours credit. It includes the professional laboratory experiences for prospective teachers, and on-campus activities which support and reinforce abilities, attitudes, and information appropriate for teachers and students.

North Carolina Central University proposes to initiate programs in Early Childhood Education (K-3) and Intermediate Education (Grades 4-9). These programs will meet the new teacher certification requirements prescribed by the North Carolina State Board of Education, March 6, 1969.

This conference and the subsequent critical examination of the nine sets of Specifications for Comprehensive Undergraduate and In-Service Teacher Education Programs for Elementary Teachers established by the Bureau of Research Teacher Project will provide basic ideas, insights, information and perhaps the models for the actual structures of the proposed programs for North Carolina Central University.

Shaw University

Although primarily a liberal arts College, Shaw University conceives as one of its responsibilities the preparation of teachers for the public schools, and the continued education of the experienced teacher through special workshops, seminars, and other programs which contribute to the development of sound educational practice.

Shaw is looking at the nine models with an eye towards identifying those characteristics which might be adapted to our institutions and community. A report of their work in this project will be prepared and circulated among all colleges that have an interest in the Shaw University Teacher Education Program.

Students who have been admitted to Shaw University and wish to become elementary or secondary teachers, may be formally admitted to the Teacher Education program after they have met the "General Education Core Requirements". They may choose either a course of study which prepares them for teaching in the elementary school or the secondary school. Students who plan to teach on the elementary level must choose a major concentration, which consists of 18 credits or 6 courses, in one of the following subject areas: English, Science, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Music. Their major advisor in the area of specialization advises them as to what courses fulfill this requirement.

The Teacher Education Program at Shaw provides all teacher candidates with a broad but firmly established base of liberal arts combined with the professional courses necessary to become a well-qualified teacher.

Curricula preparing students to meet the requirements for teacher certification in the public schools of North Carolina and other states are offered in the Division of Teacher Education of the College of Arts and Sciences in conjunction with other academic divisions. For students who plan to teach in states other than North Carolina, curriculum adjustments are made.

Students seeking teacher certification in elementary schools must major in one of the following: English, Science, Mathematics, Music, or Social Science.

Professional requirements in course work and student teaching are administered by the Director of Teacher Education, assisted by a faculty committee.

South Carolina State College

South Carolina State College is a predominantly Negro Land Grant Institution. It is located in the central part of South Carolina and in a predominantly agricultural area. It is basically a Liberal Arts College and Teacher Education Institution. More than half of the graduates prepare for teaching careers. Its enrollment is approximately 1,800 students with a projected enrollment of 2,500 in the near future.

The professional education faculty is composed of 13 faculty members with 60% holding the doctoral degree. The faculty is responsible for teaching all professional education courses and the administration of Directed Teachers.

South Carolina State College, like many other predominately Negro colleges, faces its share of problems. Some of the more obvious ones are as follows: (1) Inability to attract, in large numbers, top calibre students who are likely to choose more prestigious colleges, with scholarships often being provided; (2) The size of the physical plants does not permit accepting all qualified students who apply; (3) While improvements are steadily being made, it is difficult to obtain the desired personnel to fill positions in the professional and services areas; (4) Since large numbers of students coming to the college graduate from high schools with inadequate staff and facilities and are themselves products of deprived environments, much remedial work is required; (5) There is a need for more coordination of all of the facilities and services of the college along with additional outside resource which may be utilized.

South Carolina State College has adopted the Florida State University Model as the main focus for directing its efforts toward innovative changes in its Elementary Education Program. An effort will also be made to embrace some facets of the models of other institutions developed under the project sponsored by The Bureau of Research Teacher Education.

Plans are presently under way to have on site visitations by members of the college staff to the Florida State University program to see some of the features of the model in operation. In addition, key members of the Florida State University faculty will be invited to come to the campus of South Carolina State College in the role of consultants to assist in the development of a workable program for the college based upon the model which has been chosen.

Tennessee State University

Tennessee State University at Nashville has evolved from a State Normal School for Negroes to a Land-Grant University through a Series of Acts by the Legislature, administrative decisions by the State of Tennessee Board of Education, and recommendations made to the State Board by appointed committees and the faculty and administration at the institution. The university was elevated to a full fledged Land-Grant University by the Tennessee State Board of Education in August, 1958.

The purpose of Tennessee State University is to make maximum contribution to the advancement of the total civilization of the state, nation, and world by so training man that he can gain a reasonable mastery of the human and natural resources.

The University is located in northwest Nashville, Tennessee, with the central campus on Centennial Boulevard at 35th Avenue. Its campus, farm lands and pastures occupy 450 acres of grounds and fields extending to the southwest banks of the Cumberland River.

Some of the problems the University courrently faces are: (1) Integration has promoted a decline in enrollment; (2) The University is not financed adequately enough to keep pace with other institutions; (3) The lack of adequate finances has hindered the University in making satisfactory efforts in research and innovative approaches to education; (4) The University has difficulty in attracting and maintaining a highly competent faculty; (5) By applying increased standards in the teacher education programs, the enrollment in teacher education has declined.

Tennessee State University has a fully developed teacher education program which is accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The program is guided by the University Undergraduate Teacher Education Executive Committee.

We propose to examine and observe the Syracuse University Plan from three prospectives. The prospectives are: Program design, components of the model program, and supporting systems.

We wish to examine and study the program design to understand how it will meet the demands of a changing world in the pluralistic situation and how it will function relevantly as to diversity of the situation. Primarily, we are intending to understand how the alternatives will be translated into responsible behaviors and characterized as:

A. Intending	Intent
B. Acting on the basis of the intention	Action
C. Accounting for the consequences of the action	Feedback
D. Using the results of the accounting to modify future intents and actions	Process

The plan to determine the relevancy of the Model Program for Tennessee State University will be the conducting of a series of five workshops for thirteen selected faculty members devoted to studying the Model Program and one field trip for each selected faculty member to Syracuse University for an on-the-spot investigation. The purpose of the workshops and the field trips will be to determine if and how the Syracuse University Plan could be used at this University and the possible relevancy of the project for us.

Xavier University

Xavier University from its earliest years has accepted as a sacred privilege the task of preparing well-qualified teachers for the elementary and secondary schools: teachers imbued with a deep sense of social and civic responsibility, who are themselves liberally educated and who possess the necessary health, the sound moral and philosophical principles, the upright character, and the professional competence so essential to their vocation.

The University offers professional training for those who plan to teach in either the elementary or secondary schools. Students in upper elementary education should select one area of academic subject matter and pursue it toward an area of concentration. Students in lower elementary education will have an area of concentration in primary and early childhood education. Efforts have been made to provide electives for the foregoing.

Students who complete successfully one of the approved programs in teacher education will qualify for certification for the State of Louisiana. Students who plan to teach in other states should consult the Director of the Division of Education regarding certification requirements in those states.

In the second semester of the freshman year, all students in all areas of teacher education enroll in what we term the "Freshman Education Lab". During the entire sophomore year, each student in education spends at least two hours a week with children or youth. This is termed the "Sophomore Activity". The Junior Observation program is undertaken, generally, during the second semester of the junior year. At this time, the students are encouraged to observe and to participate in as many activities as possible.

Norfolk State College

Norfolk State College is a four-year state-supported, multipurpose, urban, and predominantly Negro institution, located in Norfolk, Virginia. It is fully accredited by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges, and offers A.B. and B.S. Degrees in approximately twenty-four areas. The College is currently working toward NCATE accreditation.

The College has initiated and successfully carried out in the Spring Semester of 1969, a cooperative project in Teacher Education with another local college which is predominantly white. The next years plans call for similar cooperation in a tri-college arrangement, involving another developing, all-white local college. Norfolk State College has a sister relationship with New York University which has been providing the former institution with consultants to improve its educational program.

Some tentative Norfolk College criteria for a Proposed Model for Teacher Preparation are: (1) That professional sensitivity training is essential in education of teachers, (2) That inter-institutional and public school system cooperation is vital to an effective program of teacher education, (3) That the teacher education program should reflect a response of the changes in the

Urban Community, (4) That a teacher education program for elementary teachers should offer early experience in working with children, (5) That a teacher education program for elementary teachers should be so flexible as to allow differentiated instruction and learning, (6) That a teacher education program for elementary teachers should be so structured as to permit a certain amount of self-directed learning as well as self-pacing, (7) That an on-going teacher education program must produce teachers who are capable and desirous of continuous and self-directed growth on the job.

OVERVIEW OF THE NINE MODELS

The second general session led by Dr. Bruce Joyce provided the participants with an overview of the nine models. Several points of commonality were discussed.

It was observed that:

1. All nine models assumed that schools would change enormously and that teacher education must lead this change. All models assumed a cooperative role between communities, school systems, and universities. The traditional course-oriented observation, participation teacher education programs were being replaced by instructional segments tied to behavioral objectives (modules).

2. All models stressed the (a) setting up of behavioral objectives, (b) setting up instructional specifications for achieving the objectives, (c) helping the students to administer the instruction to themselves, (d) getting feedback on pupil behavior.

3. All models stressed individualization by pacing and "style" of the individual learner.

4. All models contained management control "systems". This element determined who would do what and when. This element led to instantaneous and continuous revision of the entire program.

5. All models were easy to modify. They were built in segments which could be pulled out, modified, etc.

6. All models assumed the need for highly specialized teachers. Self-contained classroom goals were seen as unachievable in terms of current teacher education patterns.

7. Most models indicated simulated programs--moving from simple to complex behaviors in small groups.

Florida State University Model

The Florida model proposes a three-phase plan for preparing elementary teachers. The underclass phase of general education includes pre-professional study in the behavioral sciences. This phase represents the first two years of college. The pre-service phase begins after admission to the program, continues through the bachelor's degree and provisional certification. The in-service phase begins with the bachelor's degree and extends through three summers and two school years. The summers will be spent on campus. The two school years will be spent teaching in a portal school.

Three components have been established to facilitate the preparation program. The admissions component pre-determines entry skills and knowledges.

Provision for remediation of deficiencies are made. Second, a management control system is developed. Third, a design for faculty staffing has been developed. Three major assignments types have been identified: administration-student personnel, teaching-counseling, and selecting-producing materials.

The model is characterized by (1) utilization of performance criteria, (2) individual progress rates, (3) the monitoring of individual trainee progress through a computerized control system, and (4) a specialization aspect providing for age, subject, and differentiated teaching functions.

Michigan State University Model

This program model emphasizes clinical experiences beginning in a prospective teacher's freshman year and continuing through one year of internship. The five major areas of the program model are: (1) general education, (2) scholarly modes of knowledge, (3) professional use of knowledge, (4) human learning, and (5) clinical studies.

Short, single-purpose experience modules are directed toward the accomplishment of a particular behavioral objective.

Program differences occur along two lines: age of pupils taught and area of subject-matter specialization. Resources of university, elementary schools, and other educational agencies provide the setting for pre-service and continued professional development throughout a teacher's career.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Model

This model specifies that each prospective teacher demonstrate the ability, under simulated and live classroom conditions, to effect changes in the behavior of pupils that reflect the outcomes desired for them. The model specifies that each trainee demonstrate that he can effectively perform the tasks required of him in a school setting, that he demonstrate that he can effectively use group process skills to facilitate the application of instructional and noninstructional competencies, and that he demonstrate that he has integrated all professional competencies.

The model specifies that "instructional systems" will be employed to bring about professional competencies and their personalization; that instruction within these systems will be individualized on bases of (1) point of entry, (2) pacing, (3) sequencing, (4) etc. A computer based information management system is used to handle the frequent demands upon information created by the system.

Syracuse University Model

The Syracuse University model is a five-year program, with the first two plus years devoted to the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. In the third year the program is structured around six professional components:

(a) Methods and Curriculum, (b) Child Development, (c) Teaching Theory and Practice, (d) Professional Sensitivity Training, (e) Social and Cultural Foundations, and (f) a Self-Directed Component. Each component is a series of individualized modules using many forms of instruction, including live teaching experience, simulations, tutorials, TV directed feedback, and pupil teaching experience.

The model includes three support systems: (1) The Program Support System is responsible for design, development, and testing; (2) The Information and Evaluation Support System provides the information necessary to perform its design functions, gathers information about student progress, feeds this back to the student and the instructional staff, and evaluates the effectiveness of the program; (3) The Organizational Support System deals with the internal operating structure of the program itself and its relationship with the total university, the school system, and the educational industries and/or regional laboratories.

Teachers College, Columbia University Model

The program is built around a six process conceptual model of teaching. Three of the processes are common to all human functioning: (1) controlling knowledge, (2) self-realization, and (3) relating to others. Three are the basis for professional education: (1) shaping the school, (2) designing and executing teaching strategies, and (3) creating interpersonal climates.

The basic teaching strategy is "cooperative inquiry" and candidates are organized into "inquiry groups" of about 12 students. These groups are assisted by faculty counselors who help the students to educate themselves.

Within each group the candidates are organized into "feedback teams". Each "feedback team" consists of three or four teacher-candidates who coach each other when they are learning skills to help analyze one another's teaching and to carry out small educational experiments.

The contact laboratory is provided to give the teacher candidates the opportunity to study schools, teachers and children and also so that they can master a wide repertoire of teaching strategies, practice making curricular and instructional decisions, and engage in educational experimentation.

University of Georgia Model

The Georgia Educational Model is based upon teacher performance specifications which are lists of competencies embracing professional performance and liberal education. They were developed by interdisciplinary teams which give attention to the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective aspects of development.

Instruction is both individualized and clinical. Before undertaking any set of learnings a student must be satisfied that he has met the prerequisites for doing so, and upon the completion he must show proficiency in the learnings he set about to acquire.

To provide the student with security and uidance as he moves at his own rate through the program, specifications call for a comprehensive, continuous student orientation and advisement program.

University of Massachusetts Model

The University of Massachusetts' Model Elementary Teacher Education Program is an analysis of educational roles, tasks, structure and objectives. Trainee requirements are stated in terms of performance criteria in three major areas--human relations, behavioral skills, and subject matter knowledge. Statements of what the trainee is expected to do, under what conditions, and how he will be evaluated constitute a performance criterion. In addition, for every criterion at least two instructional alternatives are provided for learning how to meet the criterion. When the trainee meets the specified criteria requirements he will have completed the program, regardless of the length of time enrolled.

University of Pittsburgh Model

The Pittsburgh model is intended to accommodate all persons seeking initial or continuing teacher education regardless of the roles they will fill in the elementary schools and regardless of their individual training needs. The model will train teachers individually as follows: (1) the academic disciplines, (2) the professional knowledge base, (3) minimal teacher competencies, (4) the guidance of trainees through the program, and (5) the clinical setting for training.

Two key features of the model are flexibility and self-development. These are in the admission and guidance procedures. In the clinical setting, guidance procedures call for individualization beyond the learning of concepts into competencies in self-direction and inquiry, and the learning of personal-social characteristics. The model contains a feedback system for correction and self-regeneration.

University of Toledo Model

The University of Toledo model incorporates the concept of the multi-unit school and individualized research and instruction units. The general goals were developed from five contexts: instructional organization, educational technology, contemporary learning-teaching process, societal factors, and research. Behavioral objectives were prepared for these topics under the following populations concerned with teacher education: (1) Pre-service--Preschool and Kindergarten Teachers, (2) Pre-service--Elementary Teachers (Grades 1-8), (3) In-service Teachers, (4) College and University Personnel. Educational specifications were formulated to implement the entire range of behavioral objectives.

An evaluative process was designed for prompt and objective feedback for program self-correction and modification.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROBLEMS OF INNOVATION

A. The afternoon general session of the first day of the conference was devoted to some considerations of problems of innovation in teacher education. The following notes were abstracted from recorded materials and were not reviewed by the speakers. In all instances the essence of the comments are kept in context and "editorial" comments have been omitted so a . to avoid problems of misinterpretation.

Some Demands which will be Placed upon Components of Teacher Education by the Innovations in the Nine Models were discussed at length by the first afternoon speaker, Dr. John Hough. Real difficulties involved in the development and implementation of the models were noted. On the brighter side it was observed that many affective terms were used which revealed movement toward common goals.

The ideas of hope, varying states of readiness, openness toward change, dedication to innovating, and a frank willingness to look at themselves and change were discussed briefly.

A look at the hard realities of implementation by the speaker revealed that:

1. Definite new demands would be made on personnel especially field personnel but also on university personnel in the new innovative programs. Tandem styles of working rather than the traditional "cooperate with my program" was seen as a must.

2. New demands on students was observed to be related to their learning to be self-directive after twelve to fourteen years of direction by the traditional teacher. The question was raised about the extent to which the learner could be expected to become independent and increasingly responsible. Students would also be placed in the unenviable position of being trained for the use of technology which was not operative in any public school system.

3. New demands on technology from self-directed, self-paced instruction was noted as a problem. A high degree of convergence of machines and materials would be needed to implement and meet the needs of learners following independent routes to the same goals. Industry was one source of assistance.

4. Institutional organization would need to change when innovations like those in the nine models took place. This change was related to politics, power and money. Public schools, for example, would be cast in new roles in teacher training; liberal arts, psychology, and central administration would likewise be cast in new roles. Politics, power and money would be elements in these processes which would demand attention.

5. Since the new models assume success on the part of the learners rather than assuming some failure as do traditional programs, new evaluative philosophies and measures need to be developed. A whole new way of thinking in terms of getting evaluation information back to students immediately was called for. Students who are self-directive cannot make adequate decisions without data.

This portion of the first afternoon session ended with the comment that few, if any schools, were ready to implement any of the nine models or to synthesize any sizeable part of the models. But, we must take steps to get started and move ahead on testing and using the ideas in the models.

B. The second afternoon speaker, Dr. Donald Cruikshank, keyed in on processes in the development of programs. This topic took the direction of a review stage, a design stage, and an implementation stage.

Review Stage

At this stage, program developers are looking at what others are doing and/or looking at the nine models. Some approach to study of the nine models was developed through a series of criteria:

1. What is the philosophy behind the model(s)? What is the rationale for the models? What beliefs and evidence undergird the program as developed? Do we have a basis for what we are doing?

2. What are the components of the model? Can it be placed in a diagram so it can be seen? What is the relationship between the rationale and the components? Is the model internally, philosophically consistent?

3. What are the outcomes of the program? Are the outcomes really "demonstrable"?

4. What instructional techniques are suggested in the model? What new technology is needed? What is the rationale for employing the new technology?

5. What evaluation techniques are suggested? How do we process and interpret content? If starting, program evaluation must be a first concern.

6. In what ways is the model sensitive to societal needs? How does the model take into account ghetto teaching, pre-school work, inter-city teaching? What are the real presses in the university region?

7. What are the special features of the model? What provisions are made for staying current? How is it related to the general education program? How feasible is the model for your school? Is it compatible with accreditation?

Design Stage

1. What are your capabilities?

2. What are the irreducible obstacles?

3. Has the faculty that will be in the program participated in the planning?

4. Is the design in keeping with practical resources?

5. Does the design permit plenty of time for busy people to do the jobs required?

6. Have we searched out materials already developed which show promise of use in "our model"?

Implementation

1. How shall we go about substituting new behaviorally oriented materials for courses?

2. What shall become of semester hours?

3. How will we overcome the traditional grading concept?

4. How shall the faculty be retrained to use the new technology, the behavioral objectives, systems approaches, and to remove the threat of systems to the traditional role oriented.

C. At the dinner session on the evening of July 11, Dr. Keith Acheson spoke briefly on the innovation problem and approached the topic first from the standpoints of the history of Federal Government intervention in education. He noted current education acts as well as historically important milestones as the GI Bill and the Army Specialized Training Program. The contributions and main thrusts of these programs were discussed. Increasing comprehensiveness of support was noted as a significant trend. Means of innovation, such as through Federal Grants, Financed Demonstration Centers and Foundations, as ways of overcoming the burden of the cost of development time was seen as a critical point in innovation.

As a concluding comment to the discussions on innovation problems, it may be observed that the discussants were very keen on the possibilities associated with some of the instructional techniques which were integral parts of the models. Among them were micro-teaching, simulation, sensitivity training, and early involvement with learners (practicum).

PART III

SMALL GROUP PLANNING SESSIONS:
A SUMMARY

In the general discussion on Saturday, July 12, the colleges generally agreed that considerable effort would be needed if the individual needs of the developing colleges were to be adequately discovered. It was definitely felt that the contract period should be extended.

Interest in becoming better acquainted with more teaching strategies was discussed at length. It was felt that through the circulation of selected video taped sequences this need could be met. Tapes of strategies in operation (available to or through the U.S.O.E.) were to be sought by the colleges sometime after September 1.

The North Carolina Central University through Dr. Norman C. Johnson, Chairman of the Department of Education, was designated as "Clearinghouse" for information on research activity at all ten colleges. The function of this agency was described simply as dissemination of information for increased cooperation and efficient use of funds.

The colleges organized into geographical groups as follows and explored specific ways of working together.

I.	II.	III.
Alabama	Texas	Virginia
Tennessee	Louisiana	North Carolina
Georgia		South Carolina
Florida		

Some valuable resources for study were discussed and among them were: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, The Toledo Summary Report, The Georgia Research Summary Report, Clarke Criteria, "Cruickshank Criteria."

The working groups generally showed most interest in the Syracuse, Massachusetts and Michigan State Models.

One group planned a two-day conference at Clark College for October 4 and 5, 1969. Other groups planned conferences and exchange of consultants but no specified dates were designated.

Onsight visits to universities implementing model programs ranked high among group planned activity.

A need for guidelines for onsight visits was expressed by one group. This group thought that some help would be needed for maximizing the benefits derived from viewing examples of: (1) Interaction Analysis, (2) Micro-Teaching, (3) Sensitivity Training, (4) Simulation.

Finally the colleges were unanimous in expressing a need for another conference in the fall of this year.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ROSTER OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Consultants and Advisors

Dr. James P. Steffensen, Chief, Organization and Administration Branch, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S.O.E., Washington, D. C.

Dr. Donald R. Cruickshank, Chairman, Early and Middle Childhood Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Dr. John Hough, Professor of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Dr. Bruce Joyce, Professor of Education, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Keith Acheson, Assistant Director, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

Miss Cheryl Ingve, Research Assistant, Bureau of Research, U.S.O.E., Washington, D. C.

Dr. Nathan Pitts, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U.S.O.E., Washington, D. C.

Mr. William Rich, Contracts and Grants Division, U.S.O.E., Washington, D. C.

Dr. Joel Burdin, Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D. C.

Participants

Dr. Norman C. Johnson, Chairman of Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, Durham, N. C.

Mr. George Clarke, Director of Student Teaching, North Carolina Central University, Durham, N. C.

Dr. Edward Nelsen, Director of Office of Research and Evaluation, North Carolina Central University, Durham, N. C.

Mrs. Carolyn T. Peele, Secretary, North Carolina Central University, Durham, N. C.

Dr. M. Sharif Hafiz, Professor of Elementary Education, Norfolk State College, Norfolk, Virginia

Mrs. Elaine Witty, Head of Department of Education, Norfolk State College, Norfolk, Virginia

Dr. N. M. McMillan, Project Director, Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.

Mrs. Ura Jones, Associate Professor of Education, Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. O. A. Dupree, Personnel Director, Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.

Miss Catherine Bryant, Secretary, Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.

Dr. Isaac Bracey, Chairman of Department of Education, South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, S. C.

Dr. Alda Lewis, Supervisor of Directed Teaching, South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, S. C.

Mr. Willis York, Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology, South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, S. C.

Dr. Julian Parker, Dean of the Graduate School, Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana

Dr. Loretta Butler, Professor of Education, Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana

Dr. Pearlie Dove, Chairman of Department of Education and Psychology, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia

Miss Rebecca E. Davis, College Supervisor of Student Teaching, Clarke College, Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Malcolm D. Williams, Dean of School of Education, Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Jerry Crosby, Assistant Dean of School of Education, Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. E. C. Powell, Dean of Instruction, Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins, Texas

Mrs. S. E. Hilliard, Professor of Teacher Education, Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins, Texas

Dr. W. E. Combs, Chairman of Department of Elementary Education, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Lillie S. Davis, Professor of Education, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Howard Fortney, Dean of College of Education, Livingston University, Livingston, Alabama

Mr. Nathaniel Reed, Acting Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, Livingston University, Livingston, Alabama

Dr. Lloyd Parnell, Chairman of Division of Administration, Research and Services, Livingston University, Livingston, Alabama

Dr. Howard R. Boozer, Vice President for Higher Education Programs, Regional Education Laboratory, Durham, N. C.

Dr. Phil Winstead, Program Associate, Regional Education Laboratory, Durham, N. C.

Dr. J. R. Meakins, Visiting Program Associate, Regional Education Laboratory, Durham, N. C.